

REMARKS

This Response is submitted in response to the Non-Final Office Action dated March 16, 2007. Claims 10, 12 and 13 are amended. Claims 14-19 are newly added. No new matter is added.

35 USC § 101 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 12-13 under 35 USC § 101 because the claimed invention is directed towards non-statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Office Action cites "A recording medium."

Applicants submit that Claims 12-13 have been amended to traverse such rejections. Claim 12 now reads, in relevant part, "A ~~recording~~ computer-readable medium." Claim 13 now reads, in relevant part, "A program on a computer-readable medium." Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 12 and 13 are in condition for allowance.

Claim Objections

The Office Action objects to Claim 10 because the claim contains confusing language. Claim 10 has been amended to overcome such objection.

Claim 10 now reads, "An information supplying apparatus according to claim 3, further comprising selecting means for selecting, based on the viewpoint information received by the receiving means from the information processing apparatuses, a highest resolution ~~of the resolutions of the image data~~ of the image data in the second direction, the image data being transmitted to the information processing apparatuses, wherein the transmitting means transmits image data of the omnidirectional images ~~which has~~ having a resolution lower than or equal to the resolution selected by the selecting means."

The amendments are fully supported in the specification see FIG.s 24-26. Applicants respectfully request that the objection is withdrawn.

35 USC § 103 Rejections

The Office Action rejects Claims 1-3, 6-9 and 11-13 under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sogabe (US Patent No. 6,762,789) and Aliaga (US Pub.

Appl. No. 2002/0176635). Applicants respectfully disagree and traverse such rejection. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Sogabe and Aliaga do not teach or suggest the claimed elements.

The Office Action states, "Sogabe does not explicitly teach an image in a second direction has a lower resolution than an image data of the first direction corresponding to the viewpoint information. Aliaga further teaches an information providing system ... capable of combining images of a different resolutions together." However, the combination of Sogabe and Aliaga do not disclose encoding the image data such that image data of an image in a second direction has a lower resolution than image data in a first direction, as is claimed and fully supported in the specification.

The Office Action cites Aliaga in paragraphs 82-83 and 101. However, Aliaga merely discloses view reconstruction having a lower resolution. Aliaga states, "view reconstruction may be accelerated during the execution of the walkthrough by using fewer mappings than columns in the reconstructed image." Additionally, Aliaga does not disclose different views having different resolutions, merely the overall reconstruction having a lower resolution. The Sogabe reference cannot be relied upon to cure the deficiencies of the Aliaga application.

Independent Claims 2-3 and 11-13 contain similar limitations as Claim 1. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1-3 and 11-13, and Claims 4-10 that depend therefrom, are patentably distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

New Claims

Claims 14-19 are newly added. No new matter is added. Claim 14 reads, in relevant part, "wherein the lower resolution is one half of the resolution of the image data of an image in a first direction." The new claims are fully supported by the specification. For example, see FIG. 6 showing the resolution being halved from N to NW and NE.

The references do not disclose encoding the image data from viewpoints adjacent to a selected viewpoint at one half of the original resolution.


For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 14-19 are patentably distinguishable and in condition for allowance.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge deposit account 02-1818 for any fees which are due and owing.

Respectfully submitted,

BELL, BOYD & LLOYD LLP

BY



Thomas C. Basso
Reg. No. 46,541
Customer No. 29175

Dated: June 15, 2007